

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,315	05/07/2	001	Joseph J. Solon	4025	8680
7	2590	12/17/2002			
Laurence R. I			EXAMINER		
	ring Village Drive THOMAS, ALEXANDER S				EXANDER S
Apt 204 Springfield, V	A 22150				
opringnoid, v.	1 22100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1772	
				DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002	//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.		_ A S
-	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/849,315	SOLON, JOSEPH J.
. arisony riodon	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexander S. Thomas	1772
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet with	th the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2002 FAILS TO F Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eithe condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendmen ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or b	0)]
a)months from the	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply e ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a) fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the pe	expire later than SIX MONTHS from the Y WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH The date on which the petition under Period of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period for the shortened statutory period statutory period for the shortened statutory period statutory pe	e mailing date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP er 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ling amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. Se		the mailing date of the linal rejection, even if
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appel CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37) 		•
The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	red because:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	lote below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: The proposed amendments to claim	ns 11 and 17 raise new issues.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 3,12 and amendment canceling the non-allowable clair		nitted in a separate, timely filed
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended claim		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>3-8,12 and 16</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,9-11,13-15,17 and 24</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-23).	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stat	tement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)
10.⊠ Other: <u>see attached PTO-948</u>	(Que	youdy S. There
	Al	LEXANDER S. THOMAS PRIMARY EXAMINER

À.





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Miller discloses stacking the strips in a flat configuration (Figures 4-6). Pignataro discloses that it is old in the art to remove the sidewalls from tires before stacking so that the tread may be eventually processed into a building component. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to remove the sidewalls from the tread in the article of the primary reference in view of the teaching of Pignataro depending on the desired final article that is to be made from the treads and if extra processing steps and expense could be tolerated.